DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 600 TM 830 394

AUTHOR Wisniewski, Richard
TITLE The Scholarly Ethos in Schools of Education.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, Montreal, Quebec, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; *Educational Research; *Ethnography; *Ethology; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Researchers; *Scholarship; *Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

This essay discusses the scholarly ethos in schools of education, the social milieu within which educational research is generated, taught and/or ignored. Ethos is defined as the central character of an institution, i.e., the modal characteristics and norms of the teacher education subculture. What students learn about research is far more a product of that ethos than the result of formal instruction. No matter how much knowledge is generated by researchers, the practices and expectations of everyday life determine the degree to which faculty and students value research. The paper presents a range of inquiry needed before the ethos is fully understood, suggesting the power of ethnographic research in conducting such research. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230600

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Scholarly Ethos In Schools of Education

Richard Wisniewski
The University of Oklahoma

Introduction

This essay discusses the scholarly ethos of schools of education, the social milieu within which educational research is generated, taught and/or ignored. Ethos is defined as the central character of an institution, i.e., the modal characteristics and norms of the teacher education subculture. What students learn about research is far more a product of that ethos than the result of formal instruction. No matter how much knowledge is generated by researchers, the practices and expectations of everyday life determine the degree to which faculty and students value research.

This view is implicit in the analysis of educational research offered by Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Zeichner:

> If we are to link teacher education to the conduct of schooling, we must pay equally close attention to universities and schools. Most studies to date examine the student in a school classroom or the effects of interaction with cooperating teachers upon the student's classroom teaching. Studies legitimate university practices when they ignore or take for granted the impact of university courses, symbols, procedures, and rituals upon the professional abilities and attitudes of students... [1]

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983. My thanks to Barbara Laquer for her assistance in preparing this paper.

TM 830 394

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Wisniewski
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

My focus is on procedures and values that influence the scholarly ethos of schools of education. When that ethos is better understood, efforts to nurture scholarship can be predicated on more realistic premises. A paradigm for the analysis of our ethos is premature but is implicit in this discussion. It can only be suggested here because I am immersed in teacher education. I am thus limited in my perceptions of its nuances.

George and Louise Spindler use the phrase "making the familiar strange" to explain the difficulty of studying phenomena in one's own culture.[2] It is easier to recognize "strange" behaviors in other cultures than in one's own environment. This explanation suggests why few studies of American culture exist and why educational researchers seldom examine their own institutions. It is less threatening to focus on distant groups than on the cohort to which one belongs. This is perhaps one reason why Harry Judge's insightful analysis of "American Graduate Schools of Education: A View From Abroad" has been well received.[3]

Teacher educators are conditioned to the folkways and mores of schools of education. We internalize the norms and expectations of our institutions. We accept institutional practices, values and rituals as givens. As encumbants of institutional roles, we predictably enact behavioral norms far more than we care to admit given the countervening cultural emphasis on individuality. There is no easy explanation for the juxtaposition

of social conditioning and individuality. I merely note this tension as a factor to be considered in explaining why we do not recognize the uniqueness of our own practices.

Putting it another way, a hidden curriculum permeates all educational institutions. Benson Snyder states that the hidden curriculum is "rooted in the professor's assumptions and values, the students' expectations, and the social context in which both teacher and taught find themselves."[4] Hidden curricula have only begun to be researched, but it is clear that they are transmitted by formal and informal mechanisms. The process is often subtle and much is yet to be learned about it.

The hidden curriculum is perhaps a more powerful transmitter of values than the formal curriculum. There is no guarantee that what is taught in courses convey what students really learn or believe. Nor is it likely that courses provide an ethical framework for professional behavior. Professional judgment and ethics are mainly left to chance, as are the ideals of scholarship. These are not easily documented assertions. Whatever their merit, it is certainly accurate to state that their applicability will vary from institution to institution.

For this reason, the concept of a continuum is fundamental to this discussion. Whatever the matter examined, data will range on a scale setting the parameters of the phenomenon. To determine

the scholarly ethos of an institution, it is necessary to identify both normative and deviant behaviors and practices. The behaviors and practices most likely to be exhibited or valued comprise the core of the ethos.

An additional definition may be useful. The terms "research" and "scholarship" are not necessarily interchangeable. Research is the more commonly utilized term and its meaning is reasonably clear. "Research" tends to be exemplified by experimental design and the statistical analysis of data. AERA programs underscore the dominance of this form of research. "Scholarship" connotes a broader view of inquiry. Scholarship includes all systematic inquiry and the methodology employed is not its hallmark. It may be experimental, historical, descriptive, ethnographic or philosophical in nature. The term connotes a breadth of view.

Educational research seldom demonstrates a breadth of view. The central characteristic of that research is its particularistic nature. Critics of educational research often speak to its fragmentation, the lack of theoretical bases, and an overdependence on experimental design. Experimental design is an important form of inquiry, but the questions about schools of education needing examination are not amenable to experimental strictures. The web of beliefs, motivations, and behaviors that comprise the ethos of any institution are unlikely to be revealed by experimental designs, no matter how sophisticated. The ques-

tions posed in this discussion require holistic examination, a Gestaltist view. This point may be exemplified by examining the way by which academic departments are ranked in respect to scholarly output. What little is known about scholarly productivity is predicated on two sources of information: the enumeration of publications and, in plain words, professional gossip.

The Assessment of Scholarly Productivity

In his examination of studies of scholarly productivity in schools of education, Maurice Esch describes these two approaches to the ranking of institutions:

> The methodology of the studies varies in data source and analysis. In one approach the cognoscenti in the disciplines of professional field are asked to rate on an ordinal scale the best departments or units in their fields. Counts of these nominations produce a ranking of "best" institutions. In a second approach, data are compiled from articles in professional journals, professional or disciplinary convention presentations, and dollar amounts of grants and contracts from external funding sources. These data form single sources or in combination are compiled to rank and rate the institutional units. [5]

Little can be said for the opinions of the cognoscenti other than that they are an expression of the mythology that permeates all callings. Flaws in surveys of the "ten best departments" are so obvious as to comprise an academic joke, yet they are consulted as holy writ. In contrast, the work of Guba and Clark in their Research on Institutions of Teacher Education studies[6] and more recent assessments by Ducharme and Agne, Schwebel and Esch pro-

vide valuable insights into knowledge production.

Productivity counts lead to the assumption that institutions with the highest production levels are more committed to scholarship. This may be true but there is far more to the scholarly ethos than the production of articles. Scholarship does not necessarily mean a product, though it most commonly will emerge as an article, book or paper. Scholarship is mainly a set of values and attitudes. It is characterized by systematic wondering and probing, by intellectual curiosity, by scepticism, and by a commitment to inquiry that permeates professional deliberations and actions. A sense of dissatisfaction with unexamined questions and answers goads the scholar.

While superior to rankings on the basis of gossip, counting publications does not reveal these aspects of scholarship or the inner workings of an institution. Such counts display the tip of the iceberg. They do not expose the hidden curriculum, the day-to-day behaviors that nurture or limit scholarship.

Because we lack insights into the dynamics of the scholarly ethos, the productivity of schools of education compared to other disciplines is not easily established. Two recent articles exemplify this fact. Ducharme and Agne argue that the educational professoriate meets the norms of the academy:

> Our study reveals dramatically that SCDE faculty are at least as productive in scholarly matters as their colleagues in other units in terms of frequency and duration of

> publishing. As with the matter of 'irrelevancy' to schools, SCDE's ought to assert their claims in this area, so critical to credability in higher education.[7]

Schwebel is more cautious in his conclusion: "It appears that education is less productive in generating knowledge than agriculture and the biological sciences and very nearly on a par with the social sciences."[8] His findings suggest that comparisons of productivity between units on campus, rather than with aggregate norms for the academy, will show education at some disadvantage. Schwebel escalates the issue:

> Without ignoring the evidence that education may not, in fact, be particularly less productive than some other disciplines, it is still appropriate to address this question about a field that accounts for more tha 1/5 of the doctorates conferred in the nation . . .[9]

I share Schwebel's concern. The ends of the continuum are clear: doctoral students working with professors strongly commi ted to scholarship at one end, and students working with professors inactive in scholarship at the other. What is the norm? What are the practices and rationalizations that support these extremes? The true picture will emerge when far more is known about the mainsprings of schools of education. Some facets of that picture are common knowledge, as exemplified by debate about the tabulation of publications.

Many argue that only publications in refereed journals should be counted as true scholarship. If only refereed outlets are counted, the assumption is made that works will be of higher

quality. Similarly, it is assumed that works published by well-known publishers are superior to those printed by vanity presses. Neither assumption guarantees the quality of mind or creativity characterizing work. Does not the history of science suggest that the more established the learned society or journal, the more narrow the ideas and methodologies valued? Does not this possibility suggest the perpetuation of conventional research wisdom?

Articles in non-refereed journals are not necessarily more creative. There indeed may be differences in the quality of work appearing in either outlet, but judgments about this matter are usually expressions of opinion, not of fact. Such judgments reflect status considerations rather than firm evidence that the quality of one outlet is better than the other. The sociology of knowledge, regretfully, remains a limited area of investigation. Professors also argue about how many articles equal one book. Is a book equal to five articles, for example? Some even argue that textbooks are not <u>real</u> books! This debate permeates tenure, merit and promotion decisions.

Given the intervening variables influencing assessments of scholarly productivity, it is not a clean or unbiased process. We need only note how the power of friendship, old boyism, racism, sexism, feuds, and faculty politics shape tenure votes.

Given this morass of faculty dynamics, how can the number of publications, refereed or not, be accepted as an indicator of scholarly productivity? The answer, of course, is that it is an attempt at a public and rational assessment, despite the variables noted. Such compiliations offer the best available information. They represent a reasonable approach to a messy problem.[10]

As reasonable as compilations of scholarship may be, additional indicators are needed. Even more importantly, how does scholarship influence the institutions from whence it emerges? How does scholarship get translated into instruction? Into professional service? Into doctoral training? Does scholarship benefit those closest to the producers, i.e., students? Does scholarship influence colleagues of the producers, other than in the merit and tenure competition?

Needed Scholarship

Enough has been said to suggest the need for inquiries designed to reveal and the utilization of research that go beyond current knowledge. The answers are buried in the day-to-day lives of faculty and students. Constructs from sociology, anthropology and social-psychology can provide the theoretical frameworks needed. A variety of methodological probes are also needed Historical analysis is absolutely vital. Much of the scholarly ethos is woven into the

histories of institutions. Descriptive studies are exceptionally important. The demographic characteristics of faculty, their training, their point of entry onto the faculty, and similar factors are best analyzed in the descriptive mode. Survey research, including extensive interviews of faculty and students, is vital, but may only partially reveal the hidden curriculum. Ethnographic studies will perhaps provide the most powerful insights into the subtleties of the scholarly ethos.

Whatever the appropriate methodologies and theoretical bases, many attributes of schools of education need study before what teachers learn about scholarship is truly known. The balance of this paper suggests some questions to be probed. The questions juxtopose the characteristics of institutions, faculty, and students against expectations for each component or actor. A six-celled framework is apparent:

	Institutional Characteristics	Faculty Characteristics	Student Characteristics
Institutional Expectations	A	B	C
Faculty Expectations	D	E	F
Student Expectations	G	H	I

Many questions can be encompassed within each cell. In Cell A, for example, university expectations for its school of education

can be examined. In Cell B, school of education and university expectations of faculty may be identified. In C, institutional expectations of students. In D, faculty expectations of the institution. In E, faculty expectations of one another, i.e., peer and reference group behaviors. In F, faculty expectations of students. In G, student expectations of the institution. In H, students expectations of their faculty. In I, student's expectations of one another, i.e., peer norms.

Many questions can be subsumed within each cell. Regarding university-wide expectations of a school of education, what is the status of education on a given campus? University publications will describe the school of education as an important part of the institution, but what is the reality beyond the rhetoric? Where does education stand in the institution's pecking order? What is the prevailing campus opinion vis-a-vis education? Do these attitudes influence who enters education? Do education students and professors resist or act out the expectations of the broader campus? What is the school's reputation in the scholarly arena?

University and school of education expectations of the faculty provide another mine for investigation. The characteristics of the faculty provide critical insights. Demographic information such as age, sex and ethnicity is important. Perhaps more important are data on the time and place of training and the

period in which faculty entered the institution. Tenure policies throughout the institution's history need to corrolated with the entry point for each faculty member.

Given the traditional missions of schools of education, how were teaching, professional service and research valued at various points in time? Faculty vitae need to be passed through the grid of each historical epoch. During periods of rapid institutional growth, it is reasonable to assume that some tenure decisions were made that would not now pass muster. To what degree is this a correct assumption?

All aspects of faculty characteristics and expectations provide insights into the institution's ethos. Most schools of education point with pride to the fact that their faculties have had extensive public school experience. To what degree does this fact explain the value placed on scholarship? Would schools of education be stronger if fewer members of the faculty had public school experience? Such a shift might increase education's university status, but what would be the impact on the practicing profession? To what degree do persons transitioning from one social system to another, i.e., public schools to university campuses, successfully internalize the norms of the academy? Given that scholarship is not highly valued in the public

schools, is this the primary reason why only some professors become scholars?

Institutional expectations of students are demonstrated in entrance requirements. Education students obviously meet overall institutional requirements for admission, but how do they compare with peers in other disciplines? Much of the evidence in this regard indicates that education majors do not score as well on standardized tests of academic achievement. Given this phenomenon, what is its impact on faculty expectations of student performance?

Faculty expectations of one another are a powerful factor in establishing behavior norms. This is a sensitive and difficult area to probe. Several examples will make this plain. What of the modeling influences of senior faculty on new faculty? Which group is more productive? Some faculty members were recruited during periods when scholarship was downplayed and have not produced any scholarship beyond their dissertation. In contrast, newer faculty have been recruited under strengthened tenure policies with higher expectations for scholarship. Scholarly modeling behavior may thus be reversed, with the newer faculty being the trend-setters.

What are the implications of such a phenomenon in the tug-of-war between new and old members of a faculty, especially if the aquisition of tenure is held as a threat over new faculty? It is conceivable that some young faculty members will not want to outshine older colleagues. They realize they need to be productive enough to gain tenure, but may not wish to embarrass non-productive professors who will vote on them. This possibility is offered merely to suggest the twists in faculty dynamics related to scholarly productivity.

What of the struggle between professors who are public school oriented and committed to teaching as opposed to research? What of the homily: "Yes, so and so is a great researcher, but he/she cannot teach." What of the gulf between the generalist and specialist? These examples are well known and need no amplification. They suggest the tensions generated by differences in values, status, background and training among professors.[11]

Within this context, the three missions of schools of education, teaching, research and service, are frequently debated. Who is better rewarded, the scholar or the practitioner? Stating that both are vitally needed in a professional school is insufficient to settle the argument. This schism is deep and dominates schools of education; it is a major variable in assessing any faculty. Are students aware of the schism? Are they courted to

either point of view? How does the debate influence them as future teachers?

Reference group behavior is critical to an understanding of these phenomena. Informal communication systems among faculty and between faculty and students are another arena for inquiry. What do faculty discuss in hallways, offices and over lunch? Is it possible to determine if scholarly concerns are is exchanged in these settings as contrasted to other professional and personal topics? I am not suggesting that scholarly discussion should dominate informal social gatherings. The question is the degree to which discussions of research take place outside of the classroom. The informal mechanisms of communication, a part of the hidden curriculum, convey far more of the life motif of a faculty than committee meetings or publications.

Analyses of faculty expectations of students should provide powerful evidence of how all the above factors are put into practice. For example, are students expected to read in depth? Familiarity with academic literature is essential to graduate study, but few assumptions regarding the quality of graduate study are safely taken for granted. Students of academic life know the variations in expectations permitted within academic departments. Hence, to what degree is deviance from extensive readings, the writing of papers and other scholarly activities the norm rather than the anomoly? Interviews with professors and

students will partially answer the question. Classroom and library participant-observation will be necessary before an accurate assessment can be made.

In respect to library holdings, a relationship between scholarly activity and the number of volumes in the library is often posited. Holdings and their usage are entirely different factors, however, with the latter being far more revealing. Unused materials, no matter how extensive, are not convincing evidence of a strong scholarly ethos. A library with relatively small holdings may have its materials used highly effectively. Do students make regular treks to the library as part of their work? Do professors regularly check holdings in their specialty so that additional works are requested? Some professors never request volumes to be added. Others make so many requests that colleagues feel they "hog" resources. Given these extremes, what is the norm at any particular institution?

In observing the teaching of professors, to what degree does challenge and response dominate discussion periods? It is charged that some education classes are arenas for the exchange of conventional wisdom. Critics assert that some professors offer opinions about schooling practices based on dated experiences. Students then describe their experiences. Generalizations may be derived from this exchange; or conclusions may

be left open, conveying the impression that all opinions have equal validity.

To what degree do professors challenge the prior conditioning of students, insisting that experiences be examined systematically and put to the test of scholarship? Is first-hand-data collection by students encouraged? Merely asking professors or students about these matters will not necessarily reveal practices. Observing many classes over a long period of time will more likely provide complete answers.

Student expectations of the institution are important for they are part of the student sub-culture which remains largely a mystery to most academics. Surfice to say that the pioneering work of Willard Waller and a number of ethnographic studies of student life suggest rich lines of inquiry. Of all academic specialists, professors of education need to be knowldgeable regarding this literature. Professors can be far more effective in challenging and/or meeting student expectations when the student sub-culture is understood.

Student evaluations of the faculty are a part of this subculture. While many variables determine teaching effectiveness, the knowledge base utilized by a professor is a key factor. Yet, persons dormant in their fields are sometimes praised for effective teaching. To what degree do students distinguish between general attributes of teaching effectiveness and the scholarly

base utilized by professors? Graduate students should be more able to assess this phenomenon but, again, interviews and classroom observation are needed before reality can be described with any accuracy.

Student expectations of one another form another arena for inquiry. Educational institutions make it difficult for students to learn from one another in formal settings. The problem is attenuated in teacher preparation since it is essentially a part-time process, even for full-time students. Most education students do not move through a preparation program over an extensive period of time with a group of peers as in law or medicine. Peer influences, therefore, are probably far weaker. Whatever their strength, how do they influence student attainment?

These questions begin to define the ethos of a school. Much of the readily available information on faculty and students on campuses is superficial. Enrollment figures, faculty loads, research grants, credit hours generated, and similar data do not describe life on campuses. Such data do not reveal the ambitions, expectations and frustrations of students and faculty in formal and informal settings. The workings of any social system, the richness of experience within it, cannot be meaningfully tabulated in broad categories. It is in the give-and-take of daily life in every conceivable setting that the institutional ethos is

revealed. It is the commonplace rather than the unusual or exemplary that reflects an ethos. Of all researchers, ethnographers are best equipped to conduct studies that deal with the questions suggested here. By participant-observation, by living within an institution, by carefully recording behaviors and incidents in a range of settings, the ethnographer can perhaps come closest to describing the ethos of an institution.

These questions do not exhaust approaches to defining the scholarly ethos of a college. Given the complexities of the research needed, it is tempting to retreat to counting refereed journal articles. Judgments will continue to be made about institutions and professors because of productivity counts. These assessments reveal only fragments of the scholarly fabric. No matter how difficult the gathering of data about all the factors that bear on scholarly productivity, there is no substitute if a comprehensive understanding is to be generated.

The Key Question

The above discussion is a prelude to the most critical probe necessary. To what degree is the knowledge base of education utilized in the planning, implementation and evaluation of programs within schools of education? Is the school of education modeling a fundamental reliance on scholarship in assessing the validity of its own programs, procedures, and outcomes?

The answer ought to be: "Of course! Academic institutions are predicated on and dedicated to the production and utilization of knowledge." Experience suggests that research is seldom applied systematically by institutions. Its usage is limited to what each individual emphasizes in his/her role in an institution. Accreditation and other institutional self-studies mainly describe the status quo. Commitments to an amorphous concept such as scholarship will be given attention in such documents, but the veneer is often thin. Rarely does the knowlege base supercede turf, political and personalistic considerations in curriculum making. Even the fact that faculty discuss research does not mean a commitment to the application of findings to institutional practices.

It is idealistic to argue that we practice what we preach. Nonetheless, that goal permeates these remarks. Education's unique mission is the preparation of teachers. Transmitting a respect for scholarship to teachers is dependent on highly visible demonstrations of scholarship within teacher training institutions. Educators may already be stronger in this regard than other academic departments. It is often stated that professors of education appear to be more self-critical of their practices. The degree of difference in this regard does not appear to be great, however.

The organization, courses and procedures of colleges of education are virtually identical to other departments, and few procedures are unique to their missions. Academic status is maintained by not deviating from established practices. Since professors of education ought to be the best informed scholars on teaching and learning, one would assume that their practices would be significantly different from other units. Schools of education ought to be on the cutting-edge of all aspects of teaching. Instruction and evaluation procedures ought to be predicated on state-of-the-art research. In most instances, this is not the case. The norms of the total university culture dominate those of each unit in that structure.

If this assessment is correct, the most powerful fact taught by schools of education is that professors preach state-of-the-art concepts but rarely demonstrate them in their own classes. I raise this uncomfortable assertion to underscore that, of all the probes needed, we need most to determine why we do not practice what we preach.

The issue is complicated by the number and characteristics of institutions preparing teachers. Many colleges define themselves as teaching institutions and the majority of schools, colleges and departments of education are not knowledge producing institutions. Given that most institutions do not offer doctorates, it follows that they would not expect professors to be en-

gaged in scholarship as a condition of employment. This phenomenon leads to a threatening question: Should institutions with no commitment to scholarship prepare teachers? At essence, teaching is an academic enterprise, despite all its other burdens. Should not teacher trainers model the full range of academic attributes, including scholarly productivity? The question is hardly rhetorical in the context of this discussion. One must add, however, that teacher educators can hardly be faulted for not modeling scholarly behavior if their institutions do not value or require such productivity. [12]

Professors in "teaching institutions" may be scholarly minded despite their institutional mission. Some professors will be well-read and active in professional associations. They are demanding of students and in many ways demonstrate a commitment to the world of the mind and to the challenge and response that characterize the scholarly ethos. If this is the case, such institutions have a role in teacher preparation. If this is not the norm, such institutions perpetuate mediocrity.

By the same token, major institutions rated high as knowledge producers need to demonstrate how scholarship characterize their programs. A high percentage of professors who publish does not mean that these individualistic activities undergird the training programs offered by the institution.

Given a host of institutional strengths and weaknesses, estimates of where a person is more likely to receive strong preparation for teaching, using scholarly productivity as the only independent variable, are prone to error. The truth is far more complex.

Whatever the reality, these are uncomfortable thoughts. They come too close to the behaviors, rationalizations and evasions of institutional life. These questions probe inadequacies we would prefer remain hidden.

They may also reveal strengths. While education is our concern, every question raised is applicable to other academic departments. No discipline is immune from these matters. Of all academic areas, education is perhaps in the best position to overcome its deficiencies. It is strongly linked to the public schools. It has endless opportunities to study teaching and learning as well as economic, political and social influences on education. Most importantly, it can directly influence public school practices.

Much has been written on the weak impact of research on school practices. Much effort has been expended on dissemination and demonstration projects. These approaches have been limited in impact because they ignore the core problem: until schools of education model a deep commitment to scholarship in their own

programs, it is unlikely that even the best research will be higly regarded by the practicing profession. There is no substitute for preparing teachers in a school of education with commitments to scholarly activities and research utilization. When such commitments and behaviors are the norm, the liklihood of teachers being more open to research will be enhanced. Regretfully, the current ethos is exemplified by a "Do as I say, rather than as I do" behavior in many instances.

Until schools of education apply scholarship in the planning, implementation and evaluation of their programs, the gap between theory and practice will never be closed. It will never be addressed except at superficial levels, as is now the norm. Until schools of education demonstrate the power of scholarship in their own programs, there is little hope that research will improve public practices.

Conclusion

This paper suggests research needed to reveal the scholarly ethos of schools of education. The repeated use of questions is deliberate. Not all the questions are of equal import, nor do they exhaust other lines of inquiry. It is in the interrelationships between questions that the complexity of analysis is apparent. When several dozen first-rate ethnographies of schools

of education are produced, we will have insights that go beyond expressions of personal experience.

Meanwhile, a few educators are pressing the need for schools of education to reverse the low emphasis on scholarship.[13] As we better understand the ethos in which we work, other efforts to improve scholarly concerns may be forthcoming. It took schools of education generations to evolve to their present state. It will be decades before a strong scholarly ethos permeates them.

I am essentially applying to schools of education the hopes for public schools expressed by Robert Schaefer in his The School as a Center of Inquiry. Schaefer writes: "By a school organized as a center of inquiry...I imply an institution characterized by a pervasive search for meaning and rationality in its work."[14] With remarkable cogency, Schaefer urges a revolutionary change in the ethos of public schools whereby teachers would be freed to behave, in many ways, as professors are expected to behave in the academy. Teachers would have the time and encouragement needed to inquire into the substance of the teaching act.

While an important and inspirational statement, Schaefer assumes that present teacher training modes can lead to a millennium without themselves undergoing drastic reforms. I cannot agree. I see no hope for a strong teaching profession until schools of education themselves are the centers of inquiry.

In order to become first-rate professional schools, scholarship must be the first order of business in all teacher preparation institutions. Teaching and professional service functions must be predicated on a constantly challenged knowledge base. All professors of education must contribute in appropriate ways to that base and to scholarly discourse. Any retreat from this goal continues to doom teacher education to a second-class status.

The need for scholarship is self-evident. No question is ever closed in education. No definitive answers will ever be known. Human learning is an ever-changing and evolutionary process. Given these characteristics, education is an incredibly fertile field for scholarly inquiry. There is no need whatever for professors of education to take a back-seat to any other discipline in respect to scholarship. The education professoriate has more opportunities to make meaningful contributions than many other academic areas. An understanding of the scholarly ethos may encourage us to take that opportunity.

Notes

[1]Thomas S. Popkewitz, R. Robert Tabachnick and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Dulling the Senses: Research in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXX, Sept.-Oct., 1979, p. 58.

[2]George and Louise Spindler, Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982), p. 24.

[3]Harry Judge, American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad. (New York: Ford Foundation, 1982). While a most insightful work, the sample of universities surveyed is atypical of teacher education and interviews were conducted only with key administrators and professors.

[4]R. Snyder, The Hidden Curriculum. (New York: Afred A. Knopf, 1971), p. 4.

[5]Marice Eash, "Education Research Productivity of Institutions of Higher Education" American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 20, Spring 1983, p. 6.

[6]G. Guba Egon and David L. Clark, Research on Institutions of Teacher Education (RITE). Indiana University, College of Education, Occasional Papers Series, 1976-77.

[7]Edward R. Ducharme and Russell M. Agne, "The Education Professoriate: A Research-Based Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. XXXIII, November-December, 1982, p. 36.

[8]Milton Schwebel, "Research Productivity of Education Faculty: A Comparative Study." Educational Studies, Vol. 13, Summer, 1982, p. 226.

[9]Ibid, pp. 226-27.

[10]The complexity of establishing research productivity across disciplines as well as an effort to systematize the process are described in Richard A. Wanner, Lionel S. Lewis and David I. Gregorio, "Research Productivity in Academia: A Comparative Study of Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities." Sociology of Education, Vol. 54, October, 1981, pp. 238-53; and in Koyi Yoda, "A Systematic Model for Evaluating Professorial Publications," Improving College and University Teaching, Sept. 1977, pp. 122-23. The latter article provides a model so complex that its utilization could only lead to even more debate about scholarly productivity.

[11]Ayers Bagley, editor, The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions. College of Education, University of Minnesota: Society of Professors of Education, 1975. The articles in this monograph are the best single source for appraisals of the educational professoriate.

[12]Cf. Richard Wisniewski, "Too Many Schools of Education? Too Little Scholarship?" College of Education, University of Minnesota: Society of Professors of Education, Monograph Series, 1983.

[13]Sylvia Tucker, et. al., Increasing the Research Capacity of Schools of Education: A Policy Inquiry, a report prepared for the National Institute of Education, Oregon State University, 1982.

[14]Robert J. Schaefer, The School as a Center of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row, 1967, p. 3.

THE SCHOLARLY ETHOS IN SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

Richard Wisniewski
University of Oklahoma

This essay discusses the scholarly ethos in schools of education, the social milieu within which educational research is generated, taught and/or ignored. Ethos is defined as the central character of an institution, i.e., the modal characteristics and norms of the teacher education subculture. What students learn about research is far more a product of that ethos than the result of formal instruction. No matter how much knowledge is generated by researchers, the practices and expectations of everyday life determine the degree to which faculty and students value research. The paper presents a range of inquiry needed before the ethos is fully understood, suggesting the power of ethnographic research in conducting such research.